

5

Docket No. UF-340XC1  
Serial No. 10/731,528Remarks

Claims 1-25 are pending in the subject application. By the amendment submitted on August 30, 2006, the applicants had amended claims 6-9, 13, and 16 and had canceled claims 1-5, 10-12, 17-20, and 24. By the present amendment, the applicants have further amended claims 16, 21, and 22 to correctly recite the steroidal quinol of the invention. No new subject matter has been added by this amendment. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found throughout the subject application. Accordingly, claims 6-9, 13-16, 21-23, and 25 are now before the Examiner for consideration.

The amendments set forth herein should not be interpreted to indicate that the applicants have agreed with, or acquiesced to, the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action. Favorable consideration of the claims now presented, in view of the remarks and amendment set forth herein, is earnestly solicited.

As an initial matter, the applicants wish to thank Examiner Badio for the indication of allowable subject matter in this case. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, the applicants have rewritten claims 6 and 13 in independent form. Thus, the applicants believe that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 16-20, and 23-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. With regard to the rejection of claim 16, the applicants have amended the claim to correctly recite the quinol 2-(1-adamantyl)-10 $\beta$ -hydroxyestra-1,4-diene-3,17-dione, which is derived from the parent compound 2-(1-adamantyl)-3-hydroxyestra-1,3,5(10)-trien-17-one. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claims 21 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Lunn *et al.* (Tetrahedron, 1968). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the Lunn *et al.* reference neither teaches nor suggests the applicant's quinol or pharmaceutical composition.

It is basic premise of patent law that, in order to anticipate, a single prior art reference must disclose within its four corners, each and every element of the claimed invention. In *Lindemann v. American Hoist and Derrick Co.*, 221 USPQ 481 (Fed. Cir. 1984), the court stated:

USPTO Case USPTO-Patent.doc

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference, disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. *Connell v. Sears Roebuck and Co.*, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *SSII Equip. S.A. v. USITC*, 216 USPQ 678 (Fed. Cir. 1983). In deciding the issue of anticipation, the [examiner] must identify the elements of the claims, determine their meaning in light of the specification and prosecution history, and identify corresponding elements disclosed in the allegedly anticipating reference. *SSII, supra*; *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clarke*, 218 USPQ 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (emphasis added). 221 USPQ at 485.

In *Dewey v. Almy Chem. Co. v. Mimex Co.*, Judge Learned Hand wrote:

No doctrine of the patent law is better established than that a prior patent . . . to be an anticipation must bear within its four corners adequate directions for the practice [of the subsequent invention] . . . if the earlier disclosure offers no more than a starting point . . . if it does not inform the art without more how to practice the new invention, it has not correspondingly enriched the store of common knowledge, and it is not an anticipation. 52 USPQ 138 (2nd Cir. 1942).

The applicants respectfully submit that Lunn *et al.* do not disclose 2-(1-adamantyl)-10 $\beta$ -hydroxyestra-1,4-diene-3,17-dione as now recited in claims 21 and 22. Instead, as noted in the Office Action, the Lunn *et al.* reference teaches the crystallization and production of 2-(adamantyl-1)-estrone (compound #2, see page 6774). The skilled artisan would readily acknowledge that the quinol 2-(1-adamantyl)-10 $\beta$ -hydroxyestra-1,4-diene-3,17-dione is not one and the same as the compound 2-(adamantyl-1)-estrone. Because Lunn *et al.* do not disclose the claimed quinol, the applicant's claims cannot be said to be anticipated by Lunn *et al.* Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection set forth under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

7

Docket No. UF-340XC1  
Serial No. 10/731,528

In view of the foregoing remarks and the amendments above and presented in the Amendment dated August 30, 2006, the applicants believe that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees under 37 CFR §§1.16 or 1.17 as required by this paper to Deposit Account No. 19-0065.

The applicants also invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any of this response, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,



Margaret Efron  
Patent Attorney  
Registration No. 47,545  
Phone: 352-375-8100  
Fax No.: 352-372-5800  
Address: P.O. Box 142950  
Gainesville, FL 32614-2950

MHU/la

J:\uf340xc1\SIUP\Amend doc\la